

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 362

RC 004 068

AUTHOR OBA, BETTY; MOSS, MARTHA
 TITLE INDIVIDUALIZING SPELLING INSTRUCTION IN THE SMALL SCHOOL.
 INSTITUTION COLORADO STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, DENVER.
 SPONS AGENCY FORD FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.
 PUB DATE 64
 NOTE 29P.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.55
 DESCRIPTORS *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS, GROUPING PROCEDURES, *INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, PHONETICS, *SMALL SCHOOLS, *SPELLING INSTRUCTION, *TEACHING METHODS
 IDENTIFIERS WESTERN STATES SMALL SCHOOLS PROJECT

ABSTRACT

TWO PROJECTS OF INDIVIDUALIZING SPELLING INSTRUCTION UTILIZING DIFFERENT METHODOLOGY ARE REPORTED IN THIS DOCUMENT. THE PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES 2-6 WAS BASED ON THE "BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY LABORATORY GUIDE," AND THE PROGRAM FOR JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS WAS DEVELOPED BY THE INSTRUCTOR OF THE PROGRAM. THE PROJECT REPORTS PRESENT EXTENSIVE PROCEDURAL DESCRIPTION, A REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH, DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS, AND PROJECT RESULTS. THE RESULTS REPORTED BY THE PROJECT INSTRUCTORS INDICATE CONSIDERABLE IMPROVEMENT IN STUDENT SPELLING ABILITY THROUGH USE OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION. (DK)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

**COLORADO
WESTERN
STATES SMALL
SCHOOLS PROJECT**



DOCUMENTATION

[Individualizing Spelling Instruction
in the Small School]

1964

The Individualization of the Teaching of
Spelling in the Elementary School

by Betty Oba

A Plan for Individualized Instruction in
Spelling for Junior High

by Martha Moss

**COLO. STATE DEPT. OF
EDUCATION · DENVER
BYRON W. HANSFORD
COMMISSIONER**

ED036362

RC004068

THE WESTERN STATES SMALL SCHOOLS PROJECT

The Western States Small Schools Project, partly financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, is designed to help the state education agencies in Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah in their efforts to improve instruction in the necessarily existent small schools. The Project began January, 1961 and will end August, 1965. Policy Board of the Project is composed of the chief state school officers of the cooperating states. Ralph G. Bohrson, Coordinator of the WSSSP, is headquartered in Denver, at the Colorado State Department of Education.

The Colorado portion of the Project, involving more than two hundred teachers and administrators in approximately thirty schools has been working in the following areas:

- Ungraded or Continuous Progress Programs
- Use of Self-Instructional Materials
- Teacher Education and In-Service Programs
- Institutes for Rural School Board Members

For additional information concerning the Colorado WSSSP, contact:

Edwin P. Hildebrand

~~Paul M. Nachtigal~~, Director
Colorado Western States Small Schools Project
State Department of Education
Denver, Colorado 80203

Betty Oba
Meeker Elementary School
Meeker, Colorado

THE INDIVIDUALIZATION OF THE TEACHING OF SPELLING
IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1963-64

Introduction

ED036362

The experimentation with an individualized spelling program done in the Meeker Elementary School was carried on in grades two through six. The decision to make an attempt at individualization in spelling was sparked by some common problems encountered by the teachers in these grades. They realized that some children were studying spelling lists too difficult for them while others were working on lists much too easy for them. Some children were able to master lists for the weekly spelling test but could not transfer this knowledge of words to their written work, or even to later spelling tests. Yet the teachers felt that the study of words made in connection with a child's regular school work needed to be supplemented by some kind of systematic instructions in daily spelling periods because studying words in lists seems to be the simplest and most effective way to learn words.

This project was felt to be an excellent one for a school of the size such as Meeker because teachers involved were able to discuss often such developments as methods being used and progress made.

The major findings of researchers in the area of spelling which are applicable to individualization have been summarized in the section of the B.Y.U. Laboratory Guide which deals with spelling. Since these are also basic to our program, they are quoted here:

1. The study of words made in connection with other curriculum areas needs to be supplemented by direct systematic instruction in daily spelling periods.
2. It is more efficient to study words in lists than in context.
3. When the meaning of a word is understood, children are more likely to use it in their writing.
4. Research shows that the best single learning activity per unit of time in learning to spell is the checking and correcting of one's own spelling test.

One of the first steps taken in the development of this program was the visit by two of our teachers, Mrs. Parr and Mrs. Watt, to the Brigham Young University Laboratory School where they saw in operation the individualized spelling program being used by that school. Since the materials being used by the B.Y.U. program were not at this time copyrighted, they were given copies of the spelling lists and the laboratory guide for using the lists.

As several teachers had expressed interest in this program, it was decided to expand the project to all teachers in grades two through six. First grade teachers were not involved because their program does not include the regular study of words in lists.

It was decided to use the spelling lists from the B.Y.U. program and the basic method of presenting the words, with the understanding that teachers in our school could experiment with these materials to develop their own approaches to individualization.

The lists used contain approximately three to four thousand words. These words were selected by Hildreth from Rinsland's study of the words most frequently used in children's writing.²

We used these words as the Laboratory School had them arranged on levels; Level I being a list of words most frequently used by children, Level II being somewhat less frequently used, etc. Within each level the lists are divided into sections A, B, and sometimes C. In each section words are classified according to structural and phonetic generalizations. These sub-groups are not uniform in size. There are 36 classifications for sub-grouping. These are as follows:

Classifications # 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5--the short vowel sounds
Classifications # 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11--the long vowel sounds

-
1. Brigham Young University Laboratory Guide, (1962-63), p. 1.
 2. Ibid., p. 2.

Classification #12--the ow and ou sound as in how and cloud
 Classification #13--the oo sound as in good
 Classification #14--the or sound as in nor
 Classification #15--the ar sound as in jar
 Classification #16--the oy and oi sounds as in toy
 Classification #17--the sound of o as in come
 Classification #18--the sound of a as in call
 Classification #19--the sound of oo as in room and new
 Classification #20--the sound of a as in along
 Classification #21--the murmur diphthongs of er, ir, ur, and or
 Classification #22--the air sound as in pair and bare
 Classification #23--the sound of ea as in death
 Classification #24--the au and aw sound as in auto and awful
 Classification #25--the sound of qu as in quick
 Classification #26--silent letters as k in knife
 Classification #27--compound words
 Classification #28--contractions
 Classification #29--capitalized proper nouns
 Classification #30--two words used as one, such as all right
 Classification #31--abbreviations
 Classification #32--possessives
 Classification #33--the prefix re-
 Classification #34--suffixes such as tion, ment, etc.
 Classification #35--hyphenated words
 Classification #36--final words, or those which do not lend themselves
 to classification according to any one generalization.

Not all levels used words falling under each of these classifications.

Level IB, for example, had no words under the classifications of 11, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, or 35. Omissions of groups varied with different levels because the only words classified were the words on the frequency level being used.

The advantage of using this arrangement of words is summarized in the

B.Y.U. Laboratory Guide:

1. Students can often complete Section A (the easier words in a list) rather rapidly, thus gaining a sense of accomplishment. This often encourages them to move ahead into the next sub-level of words.
2. The small sub-groups generally provide a convenient grouping of words for daily lessons.
3. Studying words which are grouped according to certain phonetic and structural generalizations reinforces the teaching of word analysis skills in the reading program.

There are six levels of words in the program arranged in the above manner.

In addition there were four supplementary levels labeled VII, VIII, IX, and X.

These provide practice for children who advance beyond Level VI. The words in each of these supplementary levels were arranged alphabetically and grouped for convenience under letter headings: A, B, C, D, etc.

Procedure

Basically the plan was to ascertain the spelling level of each child by administering inventory tests over as many levels as needed, beginning with Level I. These tests were teacher-prepared by random sampling of 50 words from each level. Children who made 10% or more errors on the inventory test on a certain level began their spelling program on that level. In each class there was a wide range in beginning placement, with the widest range being found in the sixth grade, where the range was from Level I to Level VI.

For the study and testing of word lists the B.Y.U. program depended upon the "buddy system" in which each child is paired with another on approximately the same level. This was the basic plan used in our intermediate grade classrooms. A student selects one or more groups of words from the level to which he has been assigned. In the intermediate grades he began his work on this list with a pre-test dictated by his spelling partner. As his partner used the words in sentences, the student wrote the words in his spelling notebook. He then checked his own words to determine those which he must study. He recorded the misspelled words and studied them, using these steps:³

- a.) Pronounce each word correctly.
- b.) Look carefully at each part of the word as it is pronounced.
- c.) Say the letters in sequence.
- d.) Attempt to recall how the word looks and spell the word to oneself.
- e.) Check this attempt at recall.
- f.) Write the word.
- g.) Check this spelling attempt.
- h.) Repeat the above steps as necessary.

As soon as the student was ready, his partner re-tested him over the same

3. Brigham Young University Laboratory Guide, (1962-63), p. 2

list of words. The student again checked his own words and listed the errors in his spelling record book.

In order to insure mastery of words studied, students were held to 90% accuracy on all tests. To double check for this mastery of words, the teacher administered periodic review tests over the lists covered by each student. This also served to impress upon the students the value of careful and honest checking of their own tests.

Spelling lists for children to use were duplicated and filed in the classroom according to level and group, so that they were accessible to the children. A central file of these words was kept in the school office so that teachers could replace copies of lists as needed. Other materials necessary for the introduction of the program were a spelling notebook for each student and a record-keeping notebook for the teacher.

In their spelling notebooks students wrote all tests which were given by their spelling partners and kept a record of misspelled words.

The teacher's record was designed to show three things. First, it recorded the point at which each student was working at periodic spelling roll calls. The teacher could then place check marks after the students' names under the appropriate level and group. This record could then be used to show when students had successfully passed review tests given by the teacher. This was shown by coloring the spaces for all groups so reviewed. The record book also contained a place for the scores for each of these review tests.

Each teacher developed her own system of record-keeping from the basic plan outlined above. A successful innovation developed was the use of simple, teacher-made progress charts for use by the students. On these charts they checked their progress through various lists. The chart showed the designated points for review tests so that the student could notify the teacher when he was ready for such a test. This made the periodic spelling notebook checks

much simpler for the teacher.⁴

As was stated earlier, teachers were allowed to experiment to determine the amount of individualization appropriate or possible in each classroom. Teachers in grades two and three soon found that they preferred to keep all students on a certain level in a group together so that more teacher presentation of material could be given. On the other hand, some teachers in the intermediate grades found that children could progress at greatly varying rates, especially if the tape recorder was utilized.

The tape recorder and teacher-recorded tapes were most easily used in classrooms equipped with jacks and earphones around the perimeter. However, the idea was also used with a jack box in other classrooms.

Here again, the tape recorder was used by different teachers in varying ways. In one classroom the teacher used tapes to test students over each group of words which was completed. This teacher found that these tests could be worked into the schedule throughout the day whenever the students had time, thus reducing the actual time for a spelling period as such to its most efficient minimum.

Another use of the tape recorder was to administer only the periodic review tests given by the teacher herself.

Advance preparation by the teacher required the recording of 70 of the review and final tests marked on the progress chart shown in the appendix of this paper. These tests were recorded on 7 inch or 5 inch reels. Generally about 12 tests consisting of 20 words could be recorded on one side of a 7 inch tape. For these tests the teacher pronounced the word, used it in a sentence, and then repeated the word again. A pause was then allowed for the student to write the word. If the words were given too fast for the student,

4. A copy of the progress chart described in this paragraph is found in the appendix of this paper.

he could turn off the tape recorder between words, or, if necessary, rewind the tape to listen to words again.

Tape reels were labeled, as were the tape boxes containing the reels. The boxes also listed the tests found on that reel, and the number to which the student should run the tape to find his particular test.

In the actual classroom situation it was often found that it was advisable to have an alternate test for most of the review tests to prevent children from studying merely the twenty words on the review test if they had to go back over any lists of words for retesting. Lack of time did not make it possible to make alternate tests for all such review tests, but some were recorded for the tests which experience showed to be the ones most often repeated by students.

The tendency for students to concentrate on the words listed in a test which they had failed to pass was somewhat reduced by the fact that all review tests were returned to the teacher immediately after the student had seen his score and written the misspelled words in his record book. These tests were then filed in the teacher's file for use in parent-teacher conferences.

Each day students indicated whether they wished a review test from the teacher on the following day. The names of these students were compiled by the teacher so that all students ready for a certain review test on that day could take the test together. When the time came for the test, the students would get the proper tape, thread it on the tape recorder, locate the desired test and take the test by listening to the words being pronounced on the tape. Earphones were used so that the students being tested did not disturb others and classroom noise didn't disturb them.

These tests were then checked by the teacher and recorded. If the student scored 90% or better correct, he recorded his score on his progress chart and proceeded to the next list. If his score was less than 90%, he would go

back and review the lists covered by that review test.

At the completion of each level a final test over the level would be given, with 90% correct also being required before the child moved on to the next level.

The teacher's record consisted of a progress chart marked in a manner similar to that of the student. However, the teacher recorded all scores on teacher-dictated tests attempted by the child. These scores were averaged at the end of the grading period and placed on the report card along with the spelling level of the student. Thus the spelling report of a student might be II 90, indicating that he was spelling on Level II with an average of 90% correct. Another student in the same class might have a report of VI 85, showing that he was spelling on Level VI with an average of 85% correct.

Use of the tape recorder enabled students to move at their own speed without the teacher having to find time to dictate a test over on a certain level before the child could move on. On some days enough different tests were desired to make the use of two or three tape recorders in a classroom desirable. Of course, this method of giving tests made other arrangements possible. For instance, the list of tests could be posted at the beginning of the day and students could take the tests as they found time or a free tape recorder during the day.

When the program was organized in the above manner, progress through the lists varied widely. Although students were assigned partners on their own level at the beginning of the program, very few partners continued to work on the same lists each day. Since any student could take a review test when he was ready, this made little difference. Because children were on varying levels, the teacher did no whole class explaining of a group of words after the program was once underway. Instead, she helped individual children with their word problems. While children were learning how to locate tests on

the tape recorder, or lists of words in the spelling file, some of the teacher's time was spent in helping with such details. However, most intermediate students became fairly proficient at this after enough practice.

It might also be noted here than an individualized approach to the practice of penmanship was used with this spelling program. As test papers were checked by the teacher, faulty penmanship was marked and a small sheet containing the correct form for making the letter or explaining the error was attached to the spelling paper before it was returned to the child so that he would use that as his practice assignment in penmanship.

Problems Encountered

Probably the major problems encountered by teachers in implementing this spelling program were the following:

1. The use of duplicated sheets is unhandy. They are easily lost or torn. Younger students had trouble locating sheets in the file. Teachers remember longingly the old convenient workbook.
2. Teachers felt insecure in a situation in which they were not directing the entire process of study. They often tended to feel that learning could not take place unless they explained the thing to be learned to the whole class.
3. The buddy system is not a quiet, orderly method of study. While it does not have to be bedlam, yet there is much more activity than in the traditional spelling classroom. Some teachers felt that no learning could take place in such an atmosphere.
4. When students are allowed to progress at their own rate, the snail's pace set by some of them is alarming. To some teachers, this was an indication of the failure of the entire program. On the other hand, some students progress so rapidly that extra work is created for the teacher as she tries to keep material prepared for them.

There is also the constant problem created by students who rush ahead and must then go back because they have failed to master material.

5. The organization of words into sub-groups in this program was somewhat confusing to those used to uniform lists. The reasons for the arrangements must be carefully explained or the numbering of sub-groups seems merely erratic.
6. There is much time and work involved in experimentation with this type of program before all the details of organization can be worked out. This seems excessive at the outset of the program and can easily destroy a teacher's enthusiasm.

Improvement Resulting from this Program

On the other hand, there were many indications that there was an improvement in the spelling program. One of these could be found in the general student enthusiasm for this type of program, and especially in the development of an attitude of willingness to assume responsibility for one's own progress. To be sure, this was not true of all students, but all those who did develop even a small measure of this responsibility have taken at least a step in the direction toward the type of education which we claim to work for in our schools.

One indication of improvement resulting from this program was seen in student progress from one level to another. The following table compares the number of students in two classes who began on a certain level with the number of students on that level at the end of the year.

4th Grade			6th Grade		
<u>Level</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>May</u>
I	23	2	I	6	0
II	4	18	II	6	3
III	4	7	III	2	5
IV	0	3	IV	4	3
V	2	1	V	2	3
VI	0	2	VI	7	2
			VII	0	2
			VIII	0	4
			IX	0	1

Examples of individual differences can be seen in some of the extremes in these two classes. The two students in the fourth grade who were still on Level I at the end of the school year had shown fair progress for part of the year, completing all of Level IA, but slowing down considerably when they reached the harder words of Level IB. The work of these students was characterized by frequent mistakes so that they had to go back over many lists several times. Special work had to be planned to help these students. On the other hand, one fourth grade student who also moved from Level I to the end of Level V during the school year also made very few mistakes in spelling. Of course, the "natural" spellers in both classes made very good progress. One of these students in the sixth grade moved from Level VI through Level IX with scores of 90% or higher on all tests.

Most of the children fell between those extremes, however, progressing steadily for the most part, with the occasional need to go back over lists to review for mastery.

For testing to determine whether mastery of words was retained over a longer period of time, it was decided at the end of the year to give a fifty-word, random-sample test, similar to those given at the beginning of the year. Students who started on a given level were tested again on that level, regardless of how far they had moved above that level.

A comparison of the September and May scores for the two classes charted above shows a substantial gain for those students who had started on Level I.

In the fourth grade the average (arithmetical mean) per cent correct in September had been 65%. In May this had increased to an 85% correct. Of this group of fourth graders, only two had scores below 80% on the May test, while four students had scores above 90% on this test.

In the sixth grade, the percentage correct had increased from 68% to 90%. Only two students in this group scored below 90%, with the lowest score being 76% and the highest score 100%.

The lowest average per cent correct on the May test was the 75% scored by the group of sixth graders who began on Level II. However, this was a gain over the 63% correct this group scored on the Level II inventory at the beginning of the school year.

At first glance it seemed disappointing that many of the scores on these 50-word tests were under 90% when the children had been held to a 90% accuracy as they progressed through the lists. However, aside from the fact that the random-sample of 50 words may have contained more than the average of the 10% of the words missed by a given child, it should also be noted that each level of words contains a number of review words from lower levels so that as a child goes on he stands a good chance of meeting the particularly troublesome words again.

The gain shown by the students beginning on Level I is considered to be the most significant, for this level contains those words used most frequently by children in their own writing. Also, most of the children who started on this level were children who normally have difficulty with spelling. If the gain shown in this study is retained, these students will be better equipped for their school work than they were, even though this gain may never be discernible on a standardized spelling achievement test.

In general, parent reaction to this spelling program could be summarized as being favorable to the idea of having each child work at his own level,

but not always happy about the materials used because they were so difficult to handle. Parents who like to help children with their work want some kind of workbook so that lists would not be easily lost or destroyed as our duplicated papers often were.

The reporting system which was explained earlier in this paper seemed to cause no concern among parents; indeed it evoked very little comment. It was explained to the parents the first reporting period at parent-teacher conferences. However, this system was used only in the intermediate grades. In grades 2 and 3 the teachers elected to remain with the conventional A, B, C, D, or F system. Here the teachers did experience some difficulty in deciding how to mark students who were working at varying levels. It was also in these grades that some complaints were received from parents about marks given.

In spite of the dissatisfaction expressed by teachers about some aspects of this program, there was basic agreement about the value of individualization. There was no desire to return to a traditional treatment of spelling, but teachers instead expressed the hope that spelling materials could be found which were adaptable to individualization and yet organized enough so that teachers, children (and parents, if need be) could use them easily.

Teachers also expressed a desire for material which allowed some formal presentation of spelling helps. With these qualifications in mind the group involved in the experimentation agreed to work with Botel's Spelling and Writing Patterns, a structural linguistic, multi-level program published by Follet Publishing Company. It is hoped that by applying the best of the ideas and techniques learned from the past year's experiences to this program and adapting it to suit our needs, that an even more successful spelling program may be developed.

A PLAN FOR INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN SPELLING
FOR JUNIOR HIGH
Martha Moss

Plateau Valley School
Collbran, Colorado
1963 - 64

I. REASONS FOR AN INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAM IN SPELLING

1. Student data.

IOWA TEST SCORES

Seventh Grade

Eighth Grade

Grade Levels in Spelling

Norms	7.8	6.8	5.8	Norms	8.8	7.8	6.8
	1964	1963	1962		1964	1963	1962
Student Number				Student Number			
1	12.4	11.5	8.9	1	12.5	12.1	11.0
2	12.5	10.1	9.1	2	9.5	7.8	6.9
3	11.9	10.8	8.1	3	9.3	8.0	6.4
4	10.4	9.4	8.5	4	9.2	9.3	8.2
5	9.9	7.5	6.3	5	9.1	9.3	8.0
6	9.9	8.8	8.9	6	9.0	8.0	7.5
7	8.8	7.6	7.0	7	9.0	8.4	8.8
8	8.8	8.4	7.1				
9	8.4	7.2	6.1				
10	8.2	7.9	6.9				
11	8.1	7.0	7.3				
12	8.0	6.8	6.3				
13	7.6	8.0	7.1	8	8.7	8.1	7.2
14	7.6	6.4	6.1	9	8.4	6.4	5.9
15	7.6	5.9	5.7	10	8.1	7.0	5.3
16	7.5	6.0	5.3	11	8.0	7.9	7.5
17	7.1	6.4	4.5	12	7.7	6.3	5.9
18	6.9	5.8	4.7	13	7.6	7.5	5.6
19	6.7	6.7	4.9	14	7.6	6.9	6.4
20	6.7	6.3	3.4	15	7.0	5.1	5.3
21	6.6	6.1	5.2	16	7.0	7.0	5.8
22	6.4	5.2	4.2	17	7.0	7.0	5.9
23	6.4	4.8	4.5	18	7.0	6.3	5.6
24	6.4	5.9	4.5	19	6.8	4.7	4.9
25	6.1	3.9	3.2	20	6.8	6.0	5.6
26	5.2	5.4	4.1	21	6.8	6.4	5.6
				22	6.6	6.3	5.8

2. Needs indicated by curriculum deficiencies. There is no curriculum set up on the secondary level in our school. I have developed a curriculum of my own, and felt it was not adequate in spelling. This was one reason for choosing this particular research and development proposal. The Colorado

Language Arts Society is working on curriculum development for a statewide K-12 program and I hope this will be a definite help to language arts teachers in the future. As it will take some time for this program to be set up, I felt it necessary to go ahead and do something about spelling in my own situation.

3. Needs indicated by existing student behavior. Students in my English classes have always dreaded spelling lists and tests as such. Two years ago I threw out the spelling workbooks which had been used for several years previously. It seemed to me that the workbooks took too much time for "busy work" and all the students didn't learn these lists. The fast learners knew the words before studying them in the workbooks, and the slow learners were unable to learn words of this difficulty.

I then taught spelling as presented in the text book, English In Action Junior, accordinating spelling with the regular English program. Instead of having a regular spelling list on a certain day each week, the classes spent two or three successive days on spelling every two or three weeks. I also used lists of words from literature units as we did those, and thus combined vocabulary and spelling. In eighth grade I also teach United States History and coordinated necessary words and terms with spelling and vocabulary as in literature. These methods I plan to continue. I feel, however, that not enough spelling of basic words is covered in this way, and so decided to try my own program.

Behavior and attitudes of students toward spelling changed immediately upon inauguration of this new program. Students in both classes of all ability ranges look forward to the days we have spelling. For the first time in teaching English I have students asking for spelling more often than it can be given.

4. Unique advantages or weaknesses of my school situation which prompted or required my effort. In our school there is no curriculum set up, so we are free to do work in any areas we wish, within reason, of course.

Our district, while not able to spend unlimited amounts on materials, has been lenient in purchasing whatever the teachers requisition. Even though we must be reasonable in the amounts ordered, we may choose what we want in the way of materials.

This school district has only one school, so there is no pressure to out-do another school. Since there is just one class per grade there is no competition here. This lack of pressure and freedom to choose might lead to poor teaching, but I feel it is a challenge.

The administration is not only cooperative, but encourages us to try new ideas and materials. This factor tends to make a teacher more alert and creative.

Since we have only one class per grade there can be no class grouping into high ability classes or low ability. This means that each class has a wide span in ability and achievement. Individualized work, it seems to me, is essential for children in these classes to progress, each as he is able. The weakness in our particular situation is that the size of our classes is too large to individualize to the degree that we would like to. Some group work is necessary, especially in totally new areas for the students, as the teacher cannot help each child individually when the classes run close to thirty students or more. Some group work is necessary for children in these classes to progress to their maximum. If instruction is not individualized the slow learners are slowly left further and further behind and the fast learners become more and more disinterested and either become behavior problems or withdraw into themselves. In such classes have always been individualized to some extent, the teacher tries to give extra help to the ones who need it and work in depth to the advanced learners, but a better way of individualizing is needed.

I chose spelling as a starting point as I realized there would be too much confusion if I tried to individualize all phases of English at once.

Spelling was also the subject which was most in need of help. It is an individual problem anyway, was most disliked, and I felt most poorly taught.

Another advantage (or possible disadvantage) which my small school situation offered is that I have English in grades seven, eight, and nine, and thus will be able to carry out the program with the same students for three years. If the individualized program is creating a positive attitude in the students and the students are learning and practicing ways of learning to spell words, and if they are learning words they are able to learn, there should be definite improvement in the three year period.

II. SUMMARY OF RELATED RESEARCH

1. Students lists. Spelling has always been a problem for me personally, and as a teacher it is one area I would especially like to be of some actual help to my students. As I have taught I have also reached the conclusion that ability in reading and in many other areas does not necessarily correlate with ability to spell.

"How the student got to be a problem. Spelling is not a problem for everyone. Some young people master spelling easily, almost unconsciously, by the time they reach college, just as they learn table manners, or driving a car, or dancing. Some of our spelling difficulties may be traced to our method of learning how to read. We read by words instead of by letters; we scarcely notice the arrangement of letters in a word. Our minds have never been trained to focus on letters. In a way this is good, and in a way that is bad. Then there are some whose minds--often very good minds--work in ways not particularly adapted to learning spelling."¹

The desire to do something about spelling in my English classes began when I took a course in teaching English in grades 7-12 at Colorado University in the summer of 1962. At that time I did considerable reading on the subject and since then have continued to read everything on the subject that I have had access to in periodicals and other publications.

The first report I studied carefully was "A Common-Sense Approach to

¹Kiersek. The Macmillan Handbook of English. p. 392.

Teaching Spelling," by Vivian B. Maine and Royal J. Morsey, published by Ball State Teachers College of Muncie, Indiana. This is a method whereby students make their own spelling lists from themes and other compositions work and spend two to four, thirty-five minute periods a week on spelling. The study is carefully set up and documented. I quote from the Forward,--

"The purpose of A Common-Sense Approach to Teaching Spelling is threefold:

A. To compare achievement in spelling of 304 high school students who received individualized instruction in spelling with 285 senior high school students who received traditional instruction in spelling.

B. To analyze the frequency and nature of spelling errors made by 589 senior high school students in 589 letters written in class in September, 1959, and 489 letters written in class in May, 1960.

C. To encourage interested elementary and high school English teachers to test in their own classrooms the common sense (individualized) approach to teaching spelling."

The conclusions reached from this study were favorable and I quote here only the first one.

"Since the gains made in spelling by the experimental students, most of whose teachers used the common-sense approach to spelling, equalled those of the control students, whose teachers used the traditional approach to spelling, it seems justifiable to recommend the common-sense approach. The participants checking of the individual experimental student's mastery of his individual spelling list was accomplished while his classmates were working on another assignment. The traditional approach to spelling usually requires a minimum of thirty-five minutes per week of every student's class time.

"The common-sense approach to teaching spelling is also supported by the well-known fact that a student who earns A's on spelling tests made up of word lists may misspell a dozen words per page when he writes a letter to his Aunt Wilma. To be effective, instruction in spelling must be related closely to writing and must lean very heavily on the development of the dictionary habit, a habit that is more likely to be developed through the common-sense approach than through the work-list approach to teaching spelling."²

From this study I began using individual lists on ninth and tenth grade English classes. I found, however, that most students habitually misspelled perhaps as few as five words and never more than eight or ten in composition work. Words they were unfamiliar with they usually checked with the dictionary.

²Maine, Vivian, and Morsey, Royal. A Common-Sense Approach to Teaching Spelling, p. 13.

I did evolve an individual word list which was valuable as vocabulary building and included all new words in any subject or reading done by the student. I found this individual list idea far more practical for vocabulary building than spelling.

My conclusion was that the individual list idea is valid, but that in order for students to learn more words, lists needed to be provided for them in addition to the lists they make from their own mistakes in composition.

2. What and how? The next reference which provided me with more background was the chapter on spelling in The Teaching of High School English by J. N. Hook. Under the section "Research in the Teaching of Spelling" Hook says:

"Even more profitable has been the research of men and women who have studied children rather than words. The difference in the two approaches is this: The word specialist asks, "What are the characteristics of the words that people need to know how to spell?" The child specialist asks, "How can children most efficaciously be taught to spell?" The word specialist is interested in the words to be mastered; the child specialist is interested in building students' desire and power to master words."³

This basic idea is one I have tried to use in setting up my program.

Under the heading "Building the Power to Spell" Hook says:

"If students are sufficiently motivated, many of them will be willing to go through the rather laborious steps recommended by Ernest Horn and Ernest Ashbaugh, two of the foremost authorities on spelling. These steps, as slightly modified by an NCTE committee, are as follows:

'In studying a word, a good procedure for a learner is, (1) to say each syllable distinctly and look at the syllable as he says it, (2) with eyes closed to think how the word looks, (3) to look at the word again to check his impression, (4) to write the word and check with the book, and (5) to repeat twice the writing and checking. If on any one of these five trials he misspells the word, he should copy it in his spelling notebook for review. Finally, he should write the group of words studied as a parent, brother, sister, or friend pronounces them for him.'

E. W. Dolch comments on the characteristics of the good speller:

'...the "good speller" (1) checks his guesses, (2) proofreads for spelling, and (3) studies the spelling of new words, which means (a) he gets the exact pronunciation of each new word, (b) he asks if this sounding tells the letters, and (c) where it does not, he finds a means of remembering the exact letters at the difficult spot. He makes this rapid check in all

³Hook, J. N. The Teaching of High School English. p. 393.

subjects, in English, in history, in science, or what not. He habitually makes this check, and does it in a few seconds only.

Good spelling, in other words, is dependent upon good spelling habits, and good spelling habits are dependent largely upon good attitudes. If wholesome attitudes have been created, what can be done to expedite the formation of good habits?⁴

This "see, say, write" method is carefully presented in our text, English in Action, Junior. This method is carefully taught to the class, and used for several lists before students work on individual lists.

Another section of Hook's chapter states:

"Sometimes students misspell words because they mispronounce them. Slovenly or otherwise inaccurate pronunciation of such words as athletic, divide, government, laboratory, recognize, and ridiculous may lead to misspelling. The proverbial stone thrown at one bird, incorrect pronunciation, may often glance off and kill a second, faulty spelling."⁵

By pairing students up for pronunciation (each child pronounces his list to his partner) I have found that the students are very aware of the sounds of words, and they insist that their partner pronounce correctly so they won't misspell the word. This works in two ways for it helps the pronouncer spell the word correctly when it is his turn to write the word.

3. Practical word lists. By this time, after approximately two years of studying and trying out various ideas in the classroom, I began to know what kind of a program I actually wanted to try. The next problem was the word lists. After much studying of lists put out by various companies I decided to use the lists in the Colorado Course of Study for Elementary Schools (1942). I finally turned to the list in desperation realizing that it was old and outmoded. What I wanted were lists of basic words which progresses in difficulty at each grade level. I also wanted plenty of words for each level. I remembered that the course of study had many more lists than newer programs and so looked it over. I found that except for a few words which are not often used anymore, and a few spellings which have changed that these word lists

⁴Ibid. pp. 395-96.

⁵Ibid. p. 398.

were what I needed. I simply cross out a few words and change the spellings of those that have changed--checking with Webster's--and have plenty of basic words for each grade level that progress in difficulty. Another point in favor of these lists is that some words are repeated from list to list with various prefixes and suffixes, thus giving the student this phase of spelling, and repetition in basic words as needed.

The programmed materials available which I had examined did not seem practical to me. The SRA spelling lab, it seemed to me, needed to have pronunciation of some kind added, and would need to have tapes made and individual head phones to go with it. This simply is not practical in my large class situation. Another weakness in this program is that words are presented in phonic grouping and did not seem to me to be as practical as groups of words as needed. It is perhaps more practical at the lower grade levels.

Grouping of words is discussed by Hook:

"Wise grouping of words seems desirable, although the scientific evidence in favor of grouping is not overwhelming."⁶

III. PROCEDURE IN THE CLASSROOM

1. Skills needed for the students. Teach the "see, say, write" method carefully and use it in the class for at least six group lessons (lists) before beginning individualized work.
2. Placement testing. Administer a test for placing students on the various levels. I made a test of six groups of words, twenty words in each group, on grade levels of fourth grade through eighth grade and one group above eighth grade level. There was a total of 120 words beginning with the lowest level (fourth grade) and progressing by levels to the highest level (ninth grade and above). This test proved effective as each child progressed well until he reached a part of the test where he began missing one-third to one-half of the

⁶Ibid. p. 398.

words. The two classes grouped as follows:

Level	Seventh Grade		Eighth Grade	
	Jan. 1	May 1	Nov. 25	May 1
A--Fourth grade	4		4	
B--Fifth grade	5	3	2	1
C--Sixth grade	13	10	10	11
D--Seventh grade	2	7	4	3
E--Eighth grade	3	4	7	4
F--Ninth and above	5	8	2	10

The figures for each class, January 1, and November 25 place the classes according to the placement test. The second columns of figures, May first, show the levels the children of each class have attained.

3. Selecting partners. On the basis of the above placement test the students in both classes were paired off. As the various levels didn't always have an even number there were two sets of three in the seventh grade and one set of three in the eighth grade. Each student had as his partner another student beginning at the same level.

4. Grouping of word lists. Word lists were prepared, with ample copies of each list so no child would have to wait for a copy of his list. Each group of word lists for each grade level were put into a folder which was labeled with a letter only. No grade levels appeared on these folders.

On levels A and B (grade 4 and 5) there were only five lists of twenty words each. This would take these students on to C level as soon as it seemed feasible.

On levels C, D, and E (grades 6, 7, and 8), the original program had ten lists of twenty words each. The F (above eighth level) had thirty words per list.

5. Individual folders. Each student was given a folder for his own spelling. In these are kept both copies of each list the child wrote from the dictation of his partner. These lists are checked for errors by the students. Before the final test is given over several lists by the teacher, the folders are handed in by whichever student or students are ready for the final test. These lists are checked carefully. Occasionally a student doesn't find a misspelled word.

It is important that these lists be checked carefully before the final test. After the final test is given it is kept in the folder and the old lists are thrown away. These final tests are the only papers that accumulate in the folders over a long period of time, and I believe it is good for the students to have these at their fingertips as they can easily see their own progress.

6. The program set-up. Students are given their folders, on which are placed the student's name, the letter of his level, and the list with which he is to begin his work. Partners are named by the teacher. Instructions for using the program are given. Students are to study alone using the "see, say, write" method. Next they are to give and take the list of words they have studied. Pronouncing these words has done much to help them spell correctly. The student corrects his own list, or if he prefers he may correct his partners list. He then studies the words he missed, again using the "see, say, write" method. Each student takes his list a second time, even if he gets all the words right on the first test. If he doesn't get 100 on the second writing, he takes the list a third time. The students soon found that it paid to study carefully and learn the words before taking them.

After the student has finished four to six lists in this way a final test is given by the teacher. There are some tests to be given at each spelling class after the program is started. Tests are made up from students individual folders and include words missed on both lists students have taken with partners. These tests are cumulative from all students on each level. Most students miss some of the same words and tests have four to eight words from each twenty word list. so tests vary from thirty to fifty words depending on how many lists are covered. This is the grade entered in the grade book. Most students average a test every two weeks if we have two spelling classes a week. They are covering, on the average, a list each class.

Class periods seem to be most effective if at least thirty minutes in length. A majority of the students seem to need this length of time to

accomplish what they want to get done in a session. If the class lasts longer, I find the students waste time and tend to play.

7. New methods and techniques. Some of the students move rather quickly from level to level. These may be students who have not been very interested in spelling previously. Most of the students soon realize which is the low level, and which is the high. One seventh grader, who is quite able in his other subjects, and who began on the A level, was determined to move out, and asked to take lists home to study. He had taken ten lists and was on the C level in about three weeks, when the majority of the class had covered four to six lists. This level was a little above his ability and he has had to slow up, but is still studying very hard, and has done well enough on his final tests that he has been able to stay on the C level.

Somehow, as the children have shifted from level to level it has worked out that all the children are in pairs and there are no more groups of threes. This is really more efficient.

The group of students in the F level seemed to need more than word lists. They now have their choice of lists or working in Word Wealth, Junior, which lends itself very well to individualized work, or cross word puzzles, which I have from "The English Journal." These puzzles are difficult and help build vocabulary. The students who went to the county spelling contest were in this level, and worked in "Words of Champions" as did any of the others on this level who wanted to.

IV. IMPROVEMENT RESULTING FROM PROGRAM

1. Evaluation of Results. The Iowa test scores were encouraging if some tabulating is done (see page 1). With the seventh grade students there were ten who did not progress a year from 1962-63 and sixteen who made at least a year's progress. The scores of 1964 showed gain here of seventeen who made more than a year's progress. This interpretation is not significant, except

that it shows that the students did not lose ground in spelling. If the gains of each student are totaled the results look somewhat better. The total gain for all twenty-six students from 1962 to 1963 is 26.9 years, and from 1963-1964 is 28.2 years. There were twelve students who tested above their grade level in 1964, and their average gain was 2.0 years. There were fourteen who tested below their grade level, and their gain was 2.7 years. So both groups made about the same progress.

In the eighth grade there were records on the Iowa tests for three successive years for twenty-two students. There were fourteen of these students in both comparisons who made less than a year's progress and eight who have made more than a year's progress. There was no change here. The total gain for all eighth grade students from 1962 to 1963 was 14.9 years and from 1963-1964 was 17.5 years. This is a slower group than the seventh grade so there were not as large gains, but the figures show more gain for students below their grade level in eighth grade than in the seventh. The total average gain for the seven eighth grade students above grade level was .6, and for those fifteen below grade level was 3.2 years. This again shows more gain in the lower group.

The most significant result of this program is not measurable, but is the attitude of the students. The fact that the student can learn to spell the words on his list has changed the attitude of hopelessness with which most poor spellers face their spelling lessons to one of hope. When these students realize that they, too, can get 100, they want to work and learn as many words as the other students, and they soon realize that they can. The fact that their partners are also working on the same level stimulates them. The attitude of the good spellers changed from boredom to one of wanting to work, also. They do more competing among themselves than any other groups.

The next most significant result is the habits the children soon establish for learning the words. They become very spelling conscious, and I am getting

in papers both in language classes and in the social studies classes with no spelling errors in most cases, and perhaps only one or two errors on papers in which students formerly had many errors.

The last important result is that the students are taking the responsibility for their own progress. Each one seems to realize that he can go as far as he wants, and with one or two exceptions in each class, the students have learned to work alone. My role as teacher has changed from that of pronouncing words and trying to make the students study, to helping and watching each child's progress. I enjoy the class as much as the students.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a few changes which would strengthen this program. Next year I plan to use it with the ninth grade, as these students are enthusiastic. I am not sure that it will be effective at this level, and if it is not, it will soon be obvious. Working in pairs may not be feasible as high school students fast become more sophisticated. I may have to make some changes for this level.

Some recommendations for changes in the program itself are that a level below A (fourth grade) may be needed for one or two students in each class. The B level (fifth grade) should be extended to about eight lists as there seems to be too much of a jump to the C level. Students in the C level (sixth grade) have had more difficulty than at the other levels, and I have expanded it to twelve lists, but plan on probably sixteen lists at this level next year. This expansion will call for relettering the program, and would divide the C level into two groups. Sixteen lists on one level would be discouraging.

It was suggested earlier that the "see, say, write" method be taught carefully before the program is used. If the students begin to get careless about using this before they take lists, it soon becomes obvious from the number of words they miss. After the individual work has been used for about three weeks, or perhaps at some other time when the need is obvious, the "see,

say, write" method should be reviewed. This could be done with words from literature, science, or social studies as a class unit.

The last recommendation for using the program is that care be used in pairing up the students. It may be necessary to do some changing of partners, but if care is used this can be kept at a minimum. In both classes pairs were mixed, some were both girls, some both boys, and some were girl and boy. The students seemed indifferent, perhaps because I was careful not to put students together that I knew didn't like each other. I had no one ask to change partners, and in most cases the partners took an interest in the progress of the other one, and seemed to work as a team.

One suggestion in closing applies to any spelling program. If a teacher insists that papers have no spelling errors, and simply returns papers without correcting spelling errors, and without grades, the students soon begin having correct spelling at least on the papers that are handed in. This seems quite impossible at first, but does get results. It is individualization in the true sense as the student is responsible for his own spelling.